

REMARKS

Claims 1-58 and 89-92 are pending. Claims 59-88 were withdrawn from consideration in an election. A Request for Continued Examination was mailed on January 9 and filed on January 12, 2007. In an Office Action mailed April 6, 2007, claims 15, 50-52 and 89-92 were allowed. Claims 1-14, 17-20, 49 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and recommendations were made to clarify the claim language, which have been implemented in the present claim amendments. Claims 1, 2, 9-11, 14, 16, 17, 19-49 and 53-58 were objected to, and amendments have been made to the claims to implement recommended changes. Applicants thank the Examiner for a very thorough examination.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the claim language was considered unclear in that "to form a block copolymer in a single step" means in a "single monomer addition step." Objections were also made to claim 1 for lacking antecedent basis for the term "the mixture," for polydispersity to reference specifically the block copolymer and to replace "polymer chain" with "block copolymer." Claim 1 has been amended to address the rejection and all the objections. An objection was made to claim 2 to strike the words "some degree of" as a modifier of "alternating character," and an appropriate amendment has been made. Claims 9-11 were objected to for insufficient antecedent basis for the term "the mixture," and these claims have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis corresponding to a related amendment made to claim 1. Claim 14 was objected to for using capital letters and "ter" where "tert" should be used. Claim 14 has been amended to make these changes. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-14 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 was allowed. An objection was made to claim 16 concerning antecedent basis for "the chain," which was amended above to reference "the block copolymer."

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the claim language was considered unclear in that the claim was directed to a "one-step process" but appeared to recite more than one step. It was suggested to clarify the language by reference to "a single monomer addition step." Claim 17 was also objected to, and a recommendation was made to change from a passive voice to an active voice. The Examiner's recommended changes to address both the rejection and the objection have been made to amended claim 17. Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17, and no objection was made to claim 18. Objections were made to claims 19 and 20, which have been addressed in the present amendments. Claim 19 was amended to

replace "further comprising providing" with "wherein" and to change "of" to "is." Claim 20 was amended to replace "chain" with "block copolymer." Therefore, claims 17-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 21 was amended to address two objections: "block copolymer" replaces "resulting polymer," and "ranges" was replaced with "lies in the range of." Claims 22 and 23 were objected to because it was unclear to what "the pressure" refers. Claims 22 and 23 were amended to state the block copolymer is formed in a reactor, and the pressure refers to the pressure in the reactor. Objection was made to the wording "about equal to or above" in claim 23, which has been amended to provide "at least about." Claim 24 was amended to address an objection, deleting "and/or" and adding "or mixtures thereof." Claims 25-30 were objected to and have been amended to replace "on the basis of the mixture" with "based on the weight." Claims 21-30 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 31 was objected to, and it was suggested to: insert "a mixture of" before "styrene," replace "in a" with "such that," change "initiator of" with "initiator is," change "resulting in a" with "such that the," and replace "un-reacted" with "unreacted." These amendments were made to claim 31. No objections were made to claims 32 and 33, and claims 31-33 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 34 was objected to and alternative language was suggested. Claim 34 has been amended to incorporate the suggested language. Claim 34 was also objected to for informalities corrected in the amended claim by replacing "in a" with "such that the" and "initiator of" with "initiator is." It was further required that the formula in claim 34 be written in the same format as used for claim 19, which has been done. Claim 35 was amended to eliminate the non-essential step of "cooling the reaction mixture," which eliminated the problem of not having an antecedent basis for "reaction mixture." It is believed that claims 34 and 35 are in condition for allowance.

An objection was made to independent claim 36, and "in a" has been replaced with "such that the" and "initiator of" has been replaced with "initiator is." It was also required that the formula be in the same format as used for claim 19, which has been done. No objection was made to claim 37, and claims 36 and 37 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Objection was made to using the terms "some" and "some degree of" in claim 38, and claim 38 has been amended responsively. The phrase "of the block copolymer" was inserted

after "polydispersity, and "polymer chain" was replaced with "block copolymer." No objection was made to claims 39-44, which depend from claim 38. Consequently, claims 38-44 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 45 was objected to, and it was required to replace "nearly pure" with "essentially pure." An amendment has been made to claim 45 to address this. No objections were made to claims 46-48, and claims 45-48 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 49 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being unclear with respect to exit fractional monomer conversion. Claim 49 was amended as follows: "the exit fractional monomer conversion is numerically at least about twice ~~or larger than~~ the mass fraction of UCA in the feed." Claim 49 was also objected to for not using "(UCA)" after "anhydride," and appropriate correction has been made. Claim 49 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 50-52 were allowed.

Claim 53 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for the same reason as claim 49, and the same amendment was made to claim 53 as was made to claim 49. Claims 53 and 54 were objected to, and "get" was required to be replaced with "obtain." Claims 53 and 54 have been amended to correct this informality. Claim 55 was objected to for using the word "type," which has been eliminated by an amendment. Claim 56 was objected to and has been amended to delete "and/or" and insert "or mixtures thereof." Claims 57 and 58 were objected to for purposes of completing form PTO-326 because they depended from claim 53, but did not contain any errors. Claims 53-58 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 59-88 are withdrawn because they were subject to a restriction requirement. Claims 89-92 were allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the amendments to the claims put the pending claims in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 12, 2007

Stephen S. Hodgson

Stephen S. Hodgson
Reg. No. 41,075

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date written below via facsimile transmission to number (571) 273-8300.

Date: June 12, 2007

Stephen S. Hodgson

Stephen S. Hodgson
Patent Attorney
2636 Albans Rd.
Houston, TX 77005
Telephone (713) 668-7711
Facsimile (713) 668-8855